



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/380,519	09/03/1999	Petri Horppu	1103326-0584	2727
7590		09/10/2009		
White & Case Patent Department 1155 Avenue of The Americas New York, NY 10036-2787				
			EXAMINER	
			MCEVOY, THOMAS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2009 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/380,519

Applicant(s)

HORPPU ET AL.

Examiner

THOMAS MCEVOY

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-9 and 15-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17, 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-9, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 1st 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon (US 4,548,201) in view of Clark et al. (US 5,643,290).

Regarding claim 1, Yoon discloses a mounting apparatus for mounting an endless cord 10 which is expandable from a contracted condition to an expanded condition onto an end of a structure (cylinder B) having a transverse dimension greater than that of the cord when in the contracted condition, said apparatus comprising a tapered adaptor 100 for the cord to be propelled over onto the end of the structure having a forward smaller end for location in the cord in its contracted condition and a rear larger end for juxtaposing with the end of the structure (Figure 18), said apparatus further comprising an expander device (Figure 21A) movable relative to the adaptor to propel the cord over the adaptor onto the rear larger end thereof, wherein the adaptor comprises a plurality of circumferentially spaced-apart fingers which extend from the rear larger end towards the forward smaller end and the expander device has a circumference and comprises a plurality of circumferentially spaced-apart arms and wherein the thickness of the arms of the expander device taper in a radial direction towards the center of the circumference (evident from Figure 21A). Yoon discloses providing channels 108 in the adaptor for guiding the cord. Yoon discloses that the expander should provide even pushing force to the cord (col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 3). Yoon fails to disclose that the arms are insertable between the fingers & the adaptor. Clark et al. teach that it is advantageous to insert arms of an expander device between fingers of an adaptor to provide better alignment and loading of a cord (Abstract; col. 2, lines 42-44 and elsewhere). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Clark et al. to have made the arms of the Yoon expander insertable between fingers of the adaptor in order to better align the adaptor and expander and

provide even pushing force to the cord. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize several ways that this could be done; for example, by adapting the arms to the already formed channels (such as by providing projections similar to those on the cord or narrowing the inner diameter of the arms to match the channels, etc.) which are already intended for a very similar purpose (alignment of the clip with the intermediate cylinder B). Regarding claim 2, the expander device is operable in a first mode thereof propel the cord over the adaptor on to the rear larger end thereof and in a second mode thereof to propel the cord from the rear larger end onto the end of the structure (col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 3). Regarding claim 5, with the above modification, the adaptor and the expander device would be adapted to mesh with one another to propel the cord over the adaptor to the rear larger end thereof. Regarding claim 6, Yoon discloses that the thickness of the circumferentially spaced-apart fingers of the adaptor taper in a radial direction towards the forward smaller end of the adaptor (col. 11, lines 47-53; this feature would read on the claim if the expander is modified to mate with channels 108). Regarding claim 7, the forward smaller end of the adaptor is presented by a central member 104. Regarding claim 8, the central member and the fingers of the adaptor are connected to one another (Figure 18). Regarding claim 9, the expander device includes a tubular section adapted to slide over the adaptor to propel the cord from the rear larger end thereof onto the end of the structure (for instance, the section directly above the 'Figure 21A' label). Regarding claim 15, Yoon discloses providing the apparatus in a kit (col. 3, lines 28-30). Regarding claim 16, the kit further comprises a surgical instrument 200 for ligating internal body tissue (Figure 23).

Response to Arguments

5. After further consideration, Examiner believes that claim 15 adds a broad structural limitation requiring the components of the mounting apparatus to be provided together by some means (even if just presented together on a surgical tray). Therefore, the previous 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd rejection of record has been withdrawn. The remainder of Applicant's arguments has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas McEvoy whose telephone number is (571) 270-5034. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anh Tuan Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 3731

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thomas Mcevoy/
Examiner, Art Unit 3731

/Anh Tuan T. Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731
09/09/09